

Remarks

The foregoing amendments are believed to place the claims into better condition for allowance or consideration on appeal. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the original claims and throughout the specification. Hence, these amendments add no new matter to the present application, and are not believed to raise issues that would require additional search. Accordingly, entry and consideration of these amendments and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 2, 6-9, 14, 17, 20, 37-40, 69 and 71-75 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 2 being the independent claims. Claims 4, 5, 47, 50-54, 57, 59, 61, 64-68, 76 and 78-82 have been canceled without prejudice to their being presented in a continuing application.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the above amendments and the following remarks, and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 14, 17, 20, 37-40, 47, 50-54, 57, 59, 61, 64-69, 71-76 and 78-82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action states that "there is no disclosure of any particular structure to function/activity relationship for the claimed genus that of *any Pol I type DNA polymerase*." Office Action at page 4; emphasis added. While Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization, in an effort to advance prosecution, the present claims have been amended to no longer recite all possible Pol I type DNA polymerases. Rather, the claims are directed to particular mutant *The* polymerases. The specification fully supports these claims (see e.g., pages 37-51 of the specification), and is fully compliant with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in

condition for immediate allowance. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian J. Del Buono", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brian J. Del Buono
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,473

Date: Nov. 23, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600